

**REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

**Status of Claims:**

No claims are currently being canceled.

Claims 60, 67, 73, 74 and 75 are currently being amended.

Claims 76 and 77 are being added.

This amendment and reply adds and amends claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After adding and amending the claims as set forth above, claims 60-77 are now pending in this application for examination on the merits, in which claims 53-59 are also pending but are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention.

**Claim Objections**

In the Office Action, claims 60, 67 and 73-75 were objected to for the reasons set forth on page 3 of the Office Action. In response, claim 73 has been amended to recite “computer-readable memory”, in accordance with the description of “memory” many separate places in the specification.

Also, “plurality of types of sentence” has been amended to “plurality of types of sentences” in claims 60, 67 and 73-75, to overcome the objection based on that phrase.

Therefore, presently pending claims 60, 67 and 73-75 are now unobjectionable.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101**

In the Office Action, claim 73 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 73 has been amended in accordance with the suggestion provided on pages 3 and 4 of the Office Action, and thus presently pending claim 73 now complies with 35 U.S.C. § 101.

**Claim Rejections under 37 U.S.C. § 102**

In the Office Action, claims 60, 67, and 73-74 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,246,981 to Papineni et al.; claims 60-64, 66-70, 72-75 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,773,344 to Gabai et al. in view of Papineni et al.; and claims 65 and 71 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gabai in view of Papineni and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,513,011 to Uwakubo. These rejections are traversed with respect to the presently pending claims under rejection, for at least the reasons given below.

Papineni discloses a natural language task-oriented dialog manager and a system for conversant interaction (see Abstract and column 3, lines 8 to 19). Further, column 15 of Papineni discloses a dialogue between a human and a computer.

However, Papineni does not disclose or suggest the operation of classifying a sentence in inputted text as one of a plurality of types of sentences, selecting a category of additional information related to the type of sentence and adding the additional information to the inputted text. Particularly, the system of Papineni responds to inputted text, it but does not add any additional information to the inputted text. For example, if the sentence is a question sentence “Whether...is questionable”, the additional information is “Please respond to...”, as described on page 10, lines 11 to 23 of the present specification.

In Papineni, the computer responses to the human input (e.g., Please Say Yes or No) are not added to any inputted text, but rather are provided to the human so that the human can respond to the computer, in order to complete a stock transaction.

Similarly, Gabai and Uwakubo do not disclose or suggest the operation of classifying a sentence in inputted text as one of a plurality of types of sentences, selecting a category of additional information related to the type of sentence and adding the additional information to the inputted text.

Accordingly, presently pending independent claims 53, 56, 60, 67 and 73-75 patentably distinguish over the cited art of record.

**New Claims:**

New claims 76 and 77 have been added, in which these new claims recites features that utilize a random number or numbers in a particular way, which are believed to patentably distinguish over the cited art of record, when taken as a whole.

**Conclusion:**

Since all of the issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed in this Amendment and Reply, Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by the credit card payment instructions in EFS-Web being incorrect or absent, resulting in a rejected or incorrect credit card transaction, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 and authorize payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 12/3/2010

By GCB

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 22428  
Telephone: (202) 945-6014  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

George C. Beck  
Registration No. 38,072  
Phillip J. Articola  
Registration No. 38,819